

Winter Visitors Study

Flagstaff Convention and Visitors Bureau

2008-2009



Produced by:
Gary Vallen Hospitality Consultants
A Division of University Associates, Incorporated
1655 North Kittredge Road; Suite #1A
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Office: (928) 853-8748; GVHospitality@yahoo.com

Gary Vallen Hospitality Consultants
A Division of University Associates, Incorporated
1655 North Kittredge Drive; Suite #1A
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Office: (928) 853-8748

Winter Visitor Study 2008-2009;
The Flagstaff Convention & Visitors Bureau

Executive Summary

The following Executive Summary presents key findings of the 2008-2009 Winter Visitor Study. Some 300 surveys were collected during each of three periods; holiday, midweek, and weekend. A fourth category, season-end summary, is the aggregate of all 900 collected surveys. For additional detail, please see the attached report.

The survey contained a total of 18 questions and was designed to understand group composition, snow-user demographics, and to determine experiential ratings of the staff and the guests' overall experience at the resort.

For respondents who lived out-of-town, further questions were designed to determine where they live, the type of accommodations they utilized while visiting Flagstaff (if any), and the amounts they spent on accommodations, food, beverage and other items. Finally, out-of-town respondents were asked about other sites, attractions, or events they would experience while staying in Flagstaff.

Executive Summary findings by period;

Holiday Results:

Of the holiday visitors that were surveyed, fifty-seven percent were male, while 43% were female.

The mean number of holiday visitor adults in a party was 4.43. The mean number of holiday visitor children in a party was 2.42.

The majority of holiday visitors stated they were either with “family” (43%) or “friends” (49%).

The average Arizona Snowbowl staff experiential rating for holiday respondents was 1.96, indicating a rating in between the “excellent” (1.0) and “very good” (2.0) response categories.

The mean rating for respondents overall Arizona Snowbowl experience was 2.39 indicating a rating in between the “very good” (2.0) and “fair” (3.0) response categories.

The mean age of holiday visitors was 42.2 years.

The mid-point of the salary ranges of holiday visitors was \$100,315 per year.

Of the 300 holiday visitors surveyed, the responses were almost evenly split with 48% of the participants living in the Flagstaff area (or within 50 miles) and 52% living outside of the area.

The mean number of times holiday, non-residents visited Flagstaff in the last twelve months was 5.09 different occasions.

For holiday non-resident visitors, 75% live in Arizona and 25% live in another state (listed in order of response; California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Nevada.

For the holiday non-resident visitors that live in Arizona, 72% live in the Phoenix area, 20% live in the Tucson area, and 7% live in another part of the state.

Some 46% of holiday non-resident visitors said they would be “staying in a hotel or motel” at a mean average nightly room rate of \$95.90.

The average number of nights holiday visitors stayed in Flagstaff was 2.74 nights.

The mean average amount each person in a party of holiday visitors spent per day on food and beverage was \$38.59.

The mean average amount a holiday visitor spent on other items per person per day was \$69.52.

When holiday visitors were asked about other sites, attractions or events they plan to see during their stay, three sites contained most of the responses; “snow play” (63%), “shopping” (48%), and “downtown Flagstaff” (32%).

Season Midweek Results:

Of the midweek visitors that were surveyed, fifty-seven percent were male, while 43% were female.

The mean number of midweek visitor adults in a party was 4.43. The mean number of midweek visitor children in a party was 2.42. Exactly the same findings as holiday visitors.

The majority of midweek visitors were either with “family” (40%) or “friends” (38%).

The average Arizona Snowbowl staff experiential rating for midweek respondents was 1.88, indicating a rating in between the “excellent” (1.0) and “very good” (2.0) response categories.

The mean rating for respondents overall Arizona Snowbowl experience was 2.11 indicating a rating in between the “very good” (2.0) and “fair” (3.0) response categories.

The mean age of midweek visitors was 37.7 years.

The mid-point of the salary ranges of midweek visitors was \$99,835 per year.

Of the 300 midweek visitors surveyed, the responses were heavily weighted towards Flagstaff locals; with 73% of the participants living in the Flagstaff area (or within 50 miles) and 27% living outside of the area.

The mean number of times midweek, non-residents visited Flagstaff in the last twelve months was 6.89 different occasions.

For midweek non-resident visitors, 79% live in Arizona and 22% live in another state (listed in order of response; Colorado, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah.

For the midweek non-resident visitors that live in Arizona, 84% live in the Phoenix area, 6% live in the Tucson area, and 13% live in another part of the state.

Some 49% of midweek non-resident visitors said they would be “staying in a hotel or motel” at a mean average nightly room rate of \$96.61.

The average number of nights midweek visitors stayed in Flagstaff was 2.53 nights.

The mean average amount each person in a party of midweek visitors spent per day on food and beverage was \$29.76.

The mean amount a midweek visitor spent on other items per person per day was \$48.71.

When midweek visitors were asked about other sites, attractions or events they plan to see during their stay, three sites contained most of the responses; “snow play” (78%), “downtown Flagstaff” (47%), and “shopping” (36%).

Season Weekend Results:

Of the weekend visitors that were surveyed, fifty-six percent were male, while 44% were female.

The mean number of weekend visitor adults in a party was 4.77. The mean number of weekend visitor children in a party was 1.24.

The majority of weekend visitors stated they were either with “family” (42%) or “friends” (49%).

The average Arizona Snowbowl staff experiential rating for weekend respondents was 1.72, indicating a rating in between the “excellent” (1.0) and “very good” (2.0) response categories.

The mean rating for respondents overall Arizona Snowbowl experience was 1.80 indicating a rating in between the “excellent” (1.0) and “very good” (2.0) response categories.

The mean age of weekend visitors was 34.6 years.

The mid-point of the salary ranges of weekend visitors was only \$60,443 per year.

Of the 300 weekend visitors surveyed, the responses were heavily weighted towards Flagstaff locals; with 63% of the participants living in the Flagstaff area (or within 50 miles) and 37% living outside of the area.

The mean number of times weekend, non-residents visited Flagstaff in the last twelve months was 4.20 different occasions.

For weekend non-resident visitors, 77% live in Arizona and 24% live in another state (listed in order of response; New Mexico, California, and Colorado.

For the weekend non-resident visitors that live in Arizona, 79% live in the Phoenix area, 10% live in the Tucson area, and 10% live in another part of the state.

Some 38% of weekend non-resident visitors said they would be “staying in a hotel or motel” at a mean average nightly room rate of \$77.20.

The average number of nights weekend visitors stayed in Flagstaff was 2.42 nights.

The mean average amount each person in a party of weekend visitors spent per day on food and beverage was \$31.89.

The mean amount a weekend visitor spent on other items per person per day was \$55.95.

When weekend visitors were asked about other sites, attractions or events they plan to see during their stay, three sites contained most of the responses; “snow play” (48%), “downtown Flagstaff” (35%), and “other” (25%).

Season-End Summary Results:

Of the season-end summary visitors surveyed, 57% were male, while 43% were female.

The mean number of season-end summary visitor adults in a party was 4.6. The mean number of season-end summary visitor children in a party was 1.9.

The majority of season-end summary visitors stated they were either with “family” (42%) or “friends” (45%).

The average Arizona Snowbowl staff experiential rating for season-end summary respondents was 1.85, indicating a rating between “excellent” (1.0) and “very good” (2.0) categories.

The mean rating for respondents overall Arizona Snowbowl experience was 2.1 indicating a rating in between the “very good” (2.0) and “fair” (3.0) response categories.

The mean age of season-end summary visitors was 38.2 years.

The mid-point of the salary ranges of season-end summary visitors was only \$86,699 per year.

Of the 900 season-end summary visitors surveyed, the responses were heavily weighted towards Flagstaff locals; with 61% of the participants living in the Flagstaff area (or within 50 miles) and 39% living outside of the area.

The mean number of times season-end summary, non-residents visited Flagstaff in the last twelve months was 5.15 different occasions.

For season-end summary non-resident visitors, 76% live in Arizona and 24% live in another state (listed in order of response; California, New Mexico, Colorado, and Nevada).

For the season-end summary non-resident visitors that live in Arizona, 77% live in the Phoenix area, 14% live in the Tucson area, and 9% live in another part of the state.

Some 44% of season-end summary non-resident visitors said they would be “staying in a hotel or motel” at a mean average nightly room rate of \$91.56.

The average number of ~~nights~~ season-end summary visitors stayed in Flagstaff was 2.6 nights.

The mean average amount each person in a party of season-end summary visitors spent per day on food and beverage was \$34.91.

Mean amount a season-end summary visitor spent on other items per person per day was \$61.39.

When season-end summary visitors were asked about other sites, attractions or events they plan to see during their stay, three sites contained most of the responses; “snow play” (63%), “downtown Flagstaff” (37%), and “shopping” (36%).

Gary Vallen Hospitality Consultants
A Division of University Associates, Incorporated
1655 North Kittredge Drive; Suite #1A
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Office: (928) 853-8748

Winter Visitor Study 2008-2009;
The Flagstaff Convention & Visitors Bureau

Economic Impact Summary

The following Economic Impact Summary is based on season-end summary findings developed in the question-by-question analysis section of the final report. The analysis of economic impact is based on a series of assumptions developed from the data collected in this study. Therefore, though the process was conservative, results are estimates and absolute accuracy of findings can not be guaranteed. Please contact Gary Vallen for any questions related to these estimates.

The estimates derived below are based upon a projected visitor season attendance of 135,000 (approximated number provided by Arizona Snowbowl in advance of their final official season count) snow-user days for the 2008-2009 season. In addition, calculations were based solely on data provided by out-of-town, non-resident visitors. No impact was calculated for Flagstaff locals (or those who live within 50 miles of Flagstaff or maintain a second home in or around Flagstaff).

Lodging Impact:

Estimated Total Spent on Hotel/Motel Lodging: \$2,757,402.60

This calculation based on survey data that includes:

1. Of the visitors that live outside of the Flagstaff area (39%, n=52,650), some 44% (n=23,166) stayed in a hotel/motel.
2. These visitors stayed an average of 2.6 nights and paid a mean average nightly room rate of \$91.56 per night, which equals an average total amount spent on their hotel/motel expense of \$238.06.
3. Assumption: Although the survey asked a question related to number of visitors in your party (see question #4), the survey did not specifically ask how many guests were staying in the average hotel room. This economic impact analysis assumes there were 2.0 guests per average hotel room.
4. Impact Does Not Include: Vacation Rentals. Remember, 11% of respondents from outside of Flagstaff (n=5,792) stayed in a vacation rental. The economic impact for vacation rentals was not included in the lodging impact amount listed above. However, if 2.0 persons stayed in the average vacation rental for 2.6 nights at a \$91.56 average rate, the additional vacation rental impact would be \$689,410.18.

Food and Beverage Impact:

Estimated Total Spent at Restaurants—food and beverage (and cocktails): \$4,742,104.58

This calculation based on survey data that includes:

1. Thirty nine percent of visitors live outside of the Flagstaff area (n=52,650).
2. Visitors that stayed overnight—includes those who stayed in a hotel or motel (44%), those who stayed with friends or relatives (21%), and those who stayed in a vacation rental (11%)—totaled 79% of all out-of-town visitors (n=41,594).
3. Assumption: The average out-of-town visitor stayed in Flagstaff a total of 2.6 nights. For purposes of this calculation, this was assumed to equate to 3 days worth of meals.
4. The mean average amount each person spent per day on food and beverage (including cocktails) was \$34.91.
5. Therefore, in three days, the average spent on food and beverage by each person that stayed overnight in Flagstaff was \$104.73.
6. Therefore, 41,594 out-of-town visitors staying overnight spent an estimated \$4,356,139.62 on restaurant food and beverage.
7. The remaining 21% (n=11,056) of out-of-town visitors who "did not stay overnight" in Flagstaff are assumed to have purchased one day of meals estimated at \$385,964.96.
8. Impact Does Not Include: Food and Beverage Purchases by Locals. Remember, 61% of snow-users for the season (82,350) are from Flagstaff, or within 50 miles of Flagstaff, or own a second home in Flagstaff. The meals and drinks purchased by these "local" snow-users were not included in the food and beverage impact amount listed above.

"Other" Purchases Impact:

Estimated Total Spent on "Other" Purchases: \$8,339,094.82

This calculation based on survey data that includes:

1. Thirty nine percent of visitors live outside of the Flagstaff area (n=52,650).
2. Visitors that stayed overnight—includes those who stayed in a hotel or motel (44%), those who stayed with friends or relatives (21%), and those who stayed in a vacation rental (11%)—totaled 79% of all out-of-town visitors (n=41,594).
3. Assumption: The average out-of-town visitor stayed in Flagstaff a total of 2.6 nights. For purposes of this calculation, this was assumed to equate to 3 days worth of "other" purchases.
4. The total spent by out-of-town visitors per person per day on "other" items was \$61.39.
5. Therefore, in three days, the average spent on "other" items by each person that stayed overnight in Flagstaff was \$184.17.
6. The total amount spent by the 41,594 out-of-town visitors staying overnight on "other" items was estimated at \$7,660,366.98.
7. The remaining 21% (n=11,056) of out-of-town visitors who "did not stay overnight" are assumed to have purchased one day's worth of "other" purchases estimated at \$678,727.84.
8. Impact Does Not Include: "Other" Purchases by Locals. Remember, 61% of snow-users for the season (82,350) are from Flagstaff, or within 50 miles of Flagstaff, or own a second home in Flagstaff. The "other" items purchased by these "local" snow-users were not included in the total "other" impact amount listed above.

Tax Implications:

Hotel/Motel Lodging Tax Implications (based on sales of \$2,757,402.60):

Sales taxes for hotel/motel establishments total 10.458%, broken down by; state sales tax (5.5%), county sales tax (1.237%), and city (3.721%). Of the 3.721% for the city, 1.721% is city sales tax and 2.0% is Bed Board and Booze (BBB) tax:

- Hotel/Motel Lodging taxes paid to the state total \$151,657.14
- Hotel/Motel Lodging taxes paid to the county total \$34,109.08
- Hotel/Motel Lodging taxes paid to the city total \$102,602.95

Restaurants and Bars Tax Implications (based on sales of \$4,742,104.58):

Sales taxes for hotel/motel establishments total 10.446%, broken down by; state sales tax (5.6%), county sales tax (1.125%), and city (3.721%). Of the 3.721% for the city, 1.721% is city sales tax and 2.0% is Bed Board and Booze (BBB) tax:

- Restaurant and Bars taxes paid to the state total \$265,557.86
- Restaurant and Bars taxes paid to the county total \$53,348.68
- Restaurant and Bars taxes paid to the city total \$176,453.71

“Other” Purchases Tax Implications (based on sales of \$8,339,094.82):

Sales taxes for other items total 8.446%, broken down by; state sales tax (5.6%), county sales tax (1.125%), and city (1.721%):

- Other taxes paid to the state total \$466,989.31
- Other taxes paid to the county total \$93,814.82
- Other taxes paid to the city total \$143,515.82

Gary Vallen Hospitality Consultants
A Division of University Associates, Incorporated
1655 North Kittredge Drive; Suite #1A
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Office: (928) 853-8748

Winter Visitor Study 2008-2009;
The Flagstaff Convention & Visitors Bureau

Methodology

Survey Design

Gary Vallen Hospitality Consultants (GVHC), in coordination with the City of Flagstaff's Convention and Visitors Bureau (Flagstaff CVB) and the Arizona Snowbowl Ski Resort (Arizona Snowbowl) collaboratively designed a snow-user survey for 2008-2009 ski season distribution. The survey was designed to be administered by a survey-distributor (interviewer) to visitors of the Arizona Snowbowl. The survey contained a total of 18 questions and was designed to understand group composition, snow-user demographics, and to determine experiential ratings of the staff and the guests' overall impressions with the resort. Additionally, for those who lived out-of-town, further questions were designed to determine where respondents live, the type of accommodations they utilized while visiting Flagstaff (if any), and the amounts they spent on accommodations, food, beverage and other items. Finally, out-of-town respondents were asked about other sites, attractions, or events they would experience while staying in Flagstaff.

The survey was divided into three sections. The first section was self-administered by the interviewer—in other words, the interviewer recorded when the survey was administered (midweek, weekend or holiday), the location of the survey (Arizona Snowbowl vs. the Nordic Center), and the gender of the participant. The second section of the survey began with an introduction, explaining the purpose of the survey and the added incentive to receive a free

drink coupon for use at Arizona Snowbowl after completing the survey. All participants were then asked to complete the first section of the survey. The first section determined group composition, experiential ratings, and demographics. The last question in this survey section was a screening question designed to ask respondents if they live within 50 miles of Flagstaff (including Williams, Winslow, and Parks) or if they owned a second home in Flagstaff. If the respondent was a “local” (lived in Flagstaff, within 50 miles of Flagstaff, or owned a second home in Flagstaff), the survey was complete. Local respondents were then thanked and provided a complimentary beverage coupon.

Out-of-town respondents who did not meet the above-listed “locals” qualifications were classified as non-residents, and the survey continued into the third and final section. For those living outside of the Flagstaff area, the final section was designed to provide information concerning each visitor’s primary residence; their travel habits; including the number of times they have visited Flagstaff in the last year, the accommodations utilized if staying over-night in Flagstaff, the number of nights they plan to stay, and whether they will visit other attractions during their stay. This third section was also designed to determine the economic impact from out-of-town visitors on the Flagstaff community. More specifically, participants were asked to quantify how much they spent (will spend) on food and beverage, hotel/motel accommodations, and any other items they purchased while at the Arizona Snowbowl or in the City of Flagstaff. For further details, see the Economic Impact Summary section of this report.

Survey Distribution

A part-time employee was hired by GVHC to conduct snow-user surveys of Arizona Snowbowl visitors. The contract timeline started with the beginning of the 2008-2009 season (December 19, 2008) and ended roughly two and a half months later (last day of collection was March 10, 2009). Data collection began with a 10-day “holiday” period that included Friday, December 26, 2008 through Sunday, January 4, 2009. During this time, 300 surveys were completed. After this time period, data collection began in the regular season with surveys collection both midweek (Monday-Thursday) and weekends (Saturday-Sunday). Because of the shared status Fridays enjoy—a day that exhibits characteristics of both midweek and weekend—data was deliberately not collected on Fridays. Three hundred surveys were collected for both the midweek time frame as well as the weekends. Therefore, a total of 900 surveys were administered to Arizona Snowbowl visitors across the three pre-defined time spans.

Survey collection was roughly stratified across five separate Arizona Snowbowl locations. Approximately 20 percent of all surveys were collected at the Agassiz Lodge, the Hart Prairie Lodge, the Hart Prairie beginner area, the Sunset Chair, and the Agassiz Chair. Each survey was orally administered and answers were recorded (bubbled) directly onto the custom-designed TeleForm survey scanning sheets. As an incentive and reward, respondents were given complimentary Arizona Snowbowl drink coupons upon completion of the survey.

The questionnaire was designed around the premise that distribution was as random as possible. The interviewer was instructed to approaching approximately every fifth snow-user that passed him. This is generally viewed as an acceptable random distribution technique and ensures a higher degree of internal validity. The interviewer was instructed to stay with the pattern of approaching every fifth visitor as a technique to avoid habitually approaching a particular type of respondent with whom he might feel most comfortable (e.g. approaching mostly college-aged women). As a result, the quality of data contained within this report will more accurately represent a cross-section of Arizona Snowbowl snow-users.

Analysis

Once the survey content was finalized, the word version was converted to a TeleForm scanning sheet (see Appendix A). All surveys were visually examined prior to scanning. They were examined for clear and recognizable bubbled responses, legible handwritten responses, as well as omitting any stray marks, lines, and tears. Most surveys met these criteria and just a few needed to be rewritten before scanning.

Use of this specialized survey form allows bubbled and handwritten answers to be scanned by an automated process with data imported directly into an Excel format. This allows for accurate data conversion as well as compilation of hand-written responses such as the exact number of adults and children in the group, the zip code of out-of-town visitors that live in Arizona, the two-letter state abbreviation of those living outside of Arizona as well as the name of a country. Once the data was scanned and imported into Excel, the file was converted to a Social Science Statistical Package (SPSS) for further analysis. With SPSS software, frequency and valid percents are more easily calculated. Due to rounding of percents, some totals may be slightly higher or lower than 100.0 percent. In addition, for multiple response questions, where a respondent may select more than one answer to a question (Question 5 and Question 18), totals are greater than 100.0 percent because

analysis is calculated on all multiple responses for that question. Lastly, for questions with “don’t know” or “refused,” the “don’t know/refused” answers were assigned as “missing” and not considered part of the valid percent calculations. Valid percent calculations are based on valid answers, where “don’t know” and “refused” were treated as a non-response and therefore were not included in the final valid percent.

Based on a projected visitor season attendance of 135,000 (approximated number provided by Arizona Snowbowl in advance of their final official season count), it was determined that 300 surveys for each collection time frame; holiday, midweek, and weekend, would most reasonably reflect Arizona Snowbowl snow-users’ perceptions, attitudes and habits. Although the interviewer attempted to select every fifth visitor, this sampling methodology is not guaranteed to be completely random. In utilizing a convenience sampling methodology, all Arizona Snowbowl visitors do not have an equal chance of being selected; therefore, the findings summarized here *are likely not* representative of the entire population of attendees. Please be informed that Gary Vallen Hospitality Consultants; Dr. Gary Vallen; and/or other related organizations do not assume responsibility that these results are representative of the Arizona Snowbowl visitor population, nor can they be generalized to this population.

Rate of Response

There were a total of 900 TeleForm forms provided to the interviewer to administer to Arizona Snowbowl visitors for the 2008-2009 season. Three hundred were completed for each of the timeframes (holiday, midweek and weekend). The interviewer reported a high response rate for those that were approached. It was estimated that roughly 80 percent of respondents agreed to take the survey when asked the first time (especially when they were told that a free drink coupon would be forthcoming).

Technically a response rate cannot assessed for the 2008-2009 Arizona Snowbowl study, however we can report that most visitors were amenable to participating in the survey. The final response rate could not be calculated, as non-responses were not recorded at the time of refusal. If the interviewer approached a visitor and they “refused” to participate, they were replaced with the next available respondent. As such, non-response surveys were not counted. Therefore, a conclusive response rate is not provided.

Economic Impact

Please refer to the attached document for a summary of the economic impact from the 2008-2009 *Winter Visitors Study*. Data contained in the body of this primary report is a question-by-question analysis of the survey results. The economic impact data has been compiled based on the resulting data with minimal assumptions used in framing the overall economic impact.

Results By Question

The following report represents a question-by-question detailed analysis of responses to the survey questions. To ensure respondent anonymity and confidentiality, the report presents results in aggregate form and individual responses are not identified. The question-by-question analysis is presented below each question and separated into four separate data sources: holiday, midweek, weekend, and all combined (season-long) aggregate survey responses. The main report is supplemented with an Economic Impact Summary and an Executive Summary. In addition, all questions for the combined (season-long) visitor responses—with the exception of information from Question 12 (zip code, state, and country)—have been depicted in graphic format (see Appendix C).

Gary Vallen Hospitality Consultants
A Division of University Associates, Incorporated
1655 North Kittredge Drive; Suite #1A
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
Office: (928) 853-8748

Winter Visitor Study 2008-2009;
The Flagstaff Convention & Visitors Bureau

Question-by-Question Data Analysis

Question 1: Date Category

The first question, self-reported by the interviewer, asked if the survey was conducted “midweek” (Monday-Thursday, excluding holiday dates), “weekend” (Saturday or Sunday, excluding holiday dates) or “holiday” (Friday, December 26, 2008 through Sunday, January 4, 2009). Surveys were not administered on Fridays, with the exception of the “holiday” period. Results from this question assisted in analysis of four data sets. The data described below is reported in four sections that include: 1) “Holiday Results,” 2) “Season Midweek Results,” 3) “Season Weekend Results,” and 4) all data combined to include midweek, weekend and holiday results described as “Season-End Summary Results.”

Question 2: Location

The second question, “Location,” was initially formulated to identify the location of the survey’s administration, at Arizona Snowbowl or at the Flagstaff Nordic Center. The initial plan was to employ an interviewer for distribution of 900 surveys at Arizona Snowbowl. The Flagstaff Nordic Center agreed to self-administer 50 surveys across each of three separate time-periods (holiday, midweek, and weekend); for a total of 150 surveys.

In fact, the Flagstaff Nordic Center was less successful than they had hoped, providing just 38 completed surveys (all identified as “holiday”) across the entire winter season.

Question 3: Gender of Participant

This question queried the respondent's gender. As in the first two questions, this was self-reported by the interviewer. Knowing the gender of Arizona Snowbowl snow-users helps with assessing the differences in perceptions between males and females for various questions on the survey.

Holiday Results:

Of the holiday visitors that were surveyed, there were more males. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents surveyed were male, while 43% were female.

Season Midweek Results:

As the season midweek snow user gender was assessed, the same proportions of respondents comprised the midweek visitors as the holiday visitors, with 57% of respondents as males and 43% as female.

Season Weekend Results:

Similar to holiday and midweek results, the gender split for weekend visitors was 56% male and 44% female.

Season-End Summary Results:

As expected, the same results for gender apply to all of the snow users, where 57% of respondents were male and 43% were female.

Question 4: Including yourself, how many adults, 18 years and older, and children are in your party today?

Once the introduction of the survey was read to the respondent, this was the first question asked of snow-users. Respondents were asked to provide the number of adults, 18 years of age and older including themselves, and the number of children, less than 18 years of age, in their party.

Holiday Results:

The number of adults in a party of holiday visitors ranged from one to eighteen people. Most holiday visitors had either four (22%) or two (21%) adults in their party. Next, 14% of respondents reported having three adults in a party. Following this, both one adult per party and seven adults per party were most frequently reported (10% each). The mean number of adults in a party was 4.43.

Children in a party of holiday visitors ranged from zero to eighteen. Most participants reported either having two (26%) or no (25%) children in their party. Following this, 18% of the respondents said they had four children. The mean number of children in a party was 2.42.

Season Midweek Results:

The number of adults contained in a midweek visitor's party had a wide range from one to sixty four. However, most reported one to twelve in their party, with only one each reporting 14, 18 or 64 people in their party (0.3% each). Most visitors (34%) stated they had four adults in their party, while one fifth (20%) said they had three in their party. Following this, 12% had seven adults in their party and another 11% reported two adults visiting Arizona Snowbowl together that day. The mean number of midweek adults visitors together in a party was 4.6, very close to the mean of holiday visitors (4.43).

The number of children in a midweek party ranged from no children to twelve. Most midweek visitors reported having no children in their party that day (39%). A little over one fifth (22%) stated there were two children in their party. Next, visitors reported either three or four children with them that day (16% each). The mean number of children in midweek visitor's party was 2.06, slightly lower than holiday visitor results (2.42).

Season Weekend Results:

Weekend visitor adults in a party ranged from one to twenty four. However, most reported between one and ten in their party that day. Unlike the midweek and holiday visitors, the numbers of adults in a party were more evenly distributed. The most frequently reported number was two adults (16%), followed closely by three and four (15% each). Parties of five and six, both had 11% each. One in a party commanded 8% of the responses, while seven and eight in a party both had 7% of the responses. The mean number of weekend adults in a party was 4.77, slightly higher than both holiday (4.43) and midweek (4.6).

The number of children in a weekend party ranged from zero to sixteen. The largest proportion (60%) of snow users did not have children with them that day. Fourteen percent were with two children and 10% of the visitors had three children with them that day. In comparing weekend visitors to midweek and holiday, this group contained the largest percentage of having no children with them that day (holiday, 25%; midweek, 39%). The mean number of children was 1.24, significantly lower than holiday (2.42) and midweek (2.06).

Season-End Summary Results:

In assessing the number of adults for all snow users, the range was one to sixty four. Almost one quarter (24%) visited in a group of four. Next, an equal number of responses occurred for parties of two and three (16% each). This is followed by equal amounts of adult parties of five and seven (9% each). The next most frequent party size was six with 7% of the responses. The mean number of adults in a party of all snow users was 4.6.

The number of children of all snow users ranged from one to eighteen. Most (41%) of all snow users did not have children with them. One fifth (20%) had two children in their party. Following this, an equal number of children were in parties of three and four (13% each). Lastly, 5% reported having one child with them. The mean number of children in the party of all snow users was 1.9.

Question 5: Are you with family, friends, people you work with, or a special group (club, church, tour group etc.)? Select all that apply.

Arizona Snowbowl visitors were asked about the composition of their group. More specifically, they were asked whether they were “visiting alone,” with “family,” “friends,” “people they work with,” or with “a special group” (club, church, tour group etc.).

Holiday Results:

Only 5% of holiday visitors stated they were “visiting alone.” The majority of snow-users were either with “family” (43%) or “friends” (49%). A small proportion stated they were visiting Arizona Snowbowl with “people they work with” (5%) or a “special group” (7%).

Season Midweek Results:

A small proportion (3%) of midweek visitors revealed they were “visiting alone” that day. The majority of respondents told the interviewer that they were there with either “family” (40%) or “friends” (38%). Twelve percent said they were with “people they work with” and a smaller number reported they were with a “special group” (6%).

Season Weekend Results:

Eight percent of weekend visitors said they were “visiting alone.” Similar to holiday and midweek, most weekend visitors stated they were either with “family” (42%) or “friends” (49%). Slightly over one fifth (23%) said they were there with “people they work with,” and the smallest amount (5%) revealed they were there with a “special group.”

Season-End Summary Results:

A small percentage (6%) of all snow users were “visiting alone.” Most visitors were either with “family” (42%) or “friends” (45%). Another 13% were visiting with “people they work with,” while only 6% were with “special group.”

Question 6: In thinking about your experience with the ski area's STAFF, how would you rate your overall customer service experience today?

Arizona Snowbowl visitors were asked to rate their experience in regard to customer service they received from ski area staff during their visit. In thinking about their experience, they were asked to rate the customer service from staff as “excellent,” “very good,” “fair,” or “poor.” If they felt they did not know or did not have an opinion, a “don’t know/not sure” selection was provided.

Holiday Results:

Approximately one-fifth (21%) of holiday respondents stated their experience with staff was “excellent.” The majority (63%) rated their experience with staff as “very good,” while 13% believed it was “fair” and only 2% felt their experience was “poor.”

The mean result was determined by scoring “excellent” as one, “very good” as two, “fair” as a three and “poor” designated as a four. In using this method to calculate the mean, the mean staff experiential rating was 1.96, strongly denoting a “very good” (2.0) response.

Season Midweek Results:

Fourteen percent of midweek snow users reported their experience with ski area staff was “excellent.” The majority (84%) stated their staff experience was “very good.” Only 2% said it was “fair,” while none of the visitors reported their experience as “poor.”

The mean result was determined by scoring “excellent” as one, “very good” as two, “fair” as a three and “poor” designated as a four. In using this method to calculate the mean, the mean staff experiential rating was 1.88, falling between “excellent” (1.0) and “very good,” (2.0) but closest to the “very good” rating. In comparing this to the holiday results (1.96), this rating was slightly better.

Season Weekend Results:

A little over one third (36%) of the weekend visitors said their experience with ski area staff was “excellent.” Most, over one half (57%), stated their experience with staff was “very good.” A much smaller proportion (7%) rated it as “fair,” and only 1% of visitors rated their experience as “poor.”

The mean result was determined by scoring “excellent” as one, “very good” as two, “fair” as a three and “poor” designated as a four. In using this method to calculate the mean, the mean staff experiential rating was 1.72, falling between “excellent” (1.0) and “very good,” (2.0) but closer to the “very good” rating. In comparing this to midweek (1.88) and holiday results (1.96), this rating was the highest.

Season-End Summary Results:

Almost one quarter (24%) of all snow users rated ski area staff as “excellent.” Most (68%) said their experience with ski area staff was “very good.” A much smaller proportion (7%) stated it was “fair,” and only 1% believed the experience with staff was “poor.”

The mean result was determined by scoring “excellent” as one, “very good” as two, “fair” as a three and “poor” designated as a four. In using this method to calculate the mean, the mean staff experiential rating was 1.85, falling between “excellent” (1.0) and “very good,” (2.0) but closer to the “very good” rating.

Question 7: In terms of your overall ski area experience—considering all elements of today's visit—how would you rate today's overall experience?

Similar to Question 6 above, Arizona Snowbowl visitors were asked to rate their overall experience, considering all elements of their visit. They were asked to use the same rating scale, including; “excellent,” “very good,” “fair,” or “poor.” Again, a “don’t know/not sure” answer category was available for those who did not give an opinion.

Holiday Results:

The results of this question were not as definitive as the rating of ski area’s staff. Fourteen percent of the holiday participants rated their overall experience as “excellent,” and 42% stated it was “very good.” Slightly over one-third (35%) said they felt the overall experience that day was “fair,” while 9% believed their experience that day was “poor.”

The mean result was determined by scoring “excellent” as one, “very good” as two, “fair” as a three and “poor” designated as a four. In using this method to calculate the mean, the mean overall experiential rating was 2.39 indicating a rating in between the “very good” (2.0) and “fair” (3.0) response categories, however leaning more towards “very good.”

Season Midweek Results:

When midweek snow users were asked about their overall experience, 9% said it was “excellent.” Most (70%) stated their overall experience that day was “very good.” Slightly over one fifth (22%) said it was “fair,” and no one stated the experience was “poor.”

The mean result was determined by scoring “excellent” as one, “very good” as two, “fair” as a three and “poor” designated as a four. In using this method to calculate the mean, the mean overall experiential rating was 2.11 indicating a rating in between “very good” (2.0) and “fair” (3.0) response categories, however leaning more towards “very good” verses “fair.” In comparing this to holiday results (2.39), this was a slightly higher rating.

Season Weekend Results:

In assessing the weekend snow users overall experience, an almost even split was reported with 40% stating it was “excellent” and 42% saying their overall experience was “very good.” Sixteen percent of visitors said it was “fair,” while only 2% said it was “poor.”

The mean result was determined by scoring “excellent” as one, “very good” as two, “fair” as a three and “poor” designated as a four. In using this method to calculate the mean, the mean overall experiential rating was 1.80 indicating a rating in between “excellent” (1.0) and the “very good” (2.0) response categories, however leaning more towards “very good.” In comparing this to holiday (2.39) and midweek results (2.11), this was a noticeably higher rating. In addition, this higher weekend rating (higher than midweek and holiday) was consistent across both questions 6 and 7.

Season-End Summary Results:

Slightly over one in five (21%) season-end visitors rated their overall experience as “excellent.” Most, a little over half (51%), rated their overall experience as “very good.” Almost one-quarter (24%) rated it as “fair,” while only 4% said their overall experience was “poor.”

The mean result was determined by scoring “excellent” as one, “very good” as two, “fair” as a three and “poor” designated as a four. In using this method to calculate the mean, the mean overall experiential rating was 2.10, indicating a rating in between “very good” (2.0) and “fair” (3.0) response categories, however strongly indicating a “very good” overall rating.

Question 8: What is your age? Please stop me at the correct category.
--

Arizona Snowbowl holiday visitors were asked to report their age by category. The question was designed in this manner to alleviate the participants’ hesitation in stating their exact age. Eight categories, “18-23 years,” “24-29 years,” “30-39 years,” “40-49 years,” “50-59 years,” “60-69 years,” “70-79 years,” and “80 years or more,” were read to the participants and they were instructed to stop the interviewer when he stated the correct category. For those visitors that did not want to offer this information, a “refused” category was available for the interviewer’s use. Since this question queries personal information, it was purposely placed after the first four questions to allow the interviewer to establish a relationship with the respondent before they were asked for more personal demographic information.

Holiday Results:

Of the 300 holiday respondents, only 10 visitors (3%) refused to provide their age category. Only 5% of the Arizona Snowbowl holiday visitors fell within the “18-23 years” category. More than twice as many (11%) stated they fell within “24-29 years.” A little over one-quarter (27%) reported they were from “30-39 years.” Most, a little over one-third (36%), stated they fell within the “40-49 years” category. Another 12% of visitors said they were “50-59 years,” while 8% reported being “60-69 years,” and only 1% fell in the “70-79 years” age range. None (0%) of the respondents were “80 years or more.” The mean age of the respondents that answered this question was 42.2 years.

Season Midweek Results:

Almost the same number of midweek respondents as holiday visitors refused to provide their age (n=13, 4%). Nine percent fell in the “18-23 years” category, while almost twice as many (17%) said they were “24-29 years.” Most, a little over one third (34%), stated they were from “30-39 years.” Following this, slightly more than one fourth (27%) said they were in the “40-49 years” category. Eleven percent of respondents were “50-59 years,” and only 2% said they were “60-69 years.” No midweek visitors (0%) reported they were either “70-79 years” or “80 years or more.” The mean age of midweek respondents was 37.7 years, slightly lower than the holiday visitors (42.2).

Season Weekend Results:

Similar to holiday and midweek respondents, 11 of the weekend respondents refused to provide their age range to the interviewer (n=11, 4%). The age ranges reported were fairly evenly distributed between the first four age categories. The “18-23 years” category contained 22%, “24-29 years” had 23%, the “30-39 years” had the most with 25%, and the “40-49 years” category contained 17%. The “50-59 years” contained 11% of the weekend visitors and a much smaller proportion of visitors fell into the “60-69 years” (3%) and “70-79 years” (0.3%) categories. None of the visitors (0%) were “80 years or more.” The mean age of weekend respondents was 34.6 years, lower than both holiday visitors (42.2) and midweek visitors (37.7).

Season-End Summary Results:

A total of 34 of all visitors refused to answer the age question (4%). Twelve percent were from “18-23 years,” and 17% ranged in age from “24-29 years.” Almost the same amounts were reported for the “30-39 years” and “40-49 years” categories (29% and 27% respectively). A smaller proportion (11%) was from “50-59 years.” The least frequently reported age categories included “60-69 years” (5%) and “70-79 years” (1%). None (0%) of the cumulative season-end visitors were “80 years or more.” The mean age of all visitors was 38.2 years.

Question 9: What was your combined household income in 2008, before taxes? Please stop me at the correct category.

Similar to Question 8 above, this question was designed to ask respondents to report personal demographic information, income, by category, to alleviate the hesitation caused in supplying the exact amount. Seven categories, “under \$25,000,” “\$25,000-\$50,000 (\$49,999),” “\$50,000-\$75,000 (\$74,999),” “\$75,000-\$100,000 (\$99,999),” “\$100,000-\$125,000 (\$124,999),” “\$125,000-\$150,000 (\$149,999),” and “over \$150,000,” were read to the respondent and, as before, they were instructed to stop the interviewer when he reached the correct category. Also, as a tool to the interviewer, a “refused” selection was included for those that did not want to provide this information. For ease of reading the categories to the respondents, they were read as round numbers and were not mutually exclusive. However, cut-off amounts were noted next to each category to alleviate any confusion. For example, if the respondent stated they were not sure if they fell into the “\$25,000-50,000” range or the “\$50,000-\$75,000” range the interviewer could state the cut-off amount for the “\$25,000-50,000” range as \$49,999.

Holiday Results:

Of the 300 holiday respondents, 61 (20%) refused to provide their income range. Generally, income is the demographic question that is most sensitive to respondents and will have the highest “refused” response. Of the 238 respondents that did provide their income range, the response range fell across multiple categories. Only 4% of holiday visitors reported earning “under \$25,000,” and the same amount (4%) earned “\$25,000-\$50,000.” Most of the visitors, approximately one in four (23%), reported earning “\$50,000-\$75,000.” Fourteen percent stated their 2007 earnings before taxes were “\$75,000-100,000.” A close second, a little over one fifth (22%), said they earned between “\$100,000-\$125,000.” Following this, 18% reported their earnings as “\$125,000-\$150,000” and another 14% earned “over \$150,000” in 2007 before taxes.

In assessing the responses, the majority (92%) of respondents reported they earn \$50,000 or more per year. Only 8% of the visitors stated their earnings fell under \$50,000 per year. The mid point of the salary ranges provided was \$100,315 per year.

Season Midweek Results:

Seventy-three midweek respondents, almost one-fourth (24%), refused to provide an income range. This is slightly higher than the holiday visitors where 20% (n=61) refused to provide an answer.

Only 2% of snow users reported an income “under \$25,000,” and 9% stated they earned “\$25,000-\$50,000.” One in five (20%) said their income ranged from “\$50,000-\$75,000.” Following this, a similar amount reported earning either “\$75,000-100,000” or “\$100,000-\$125,000” (16% and 19% respectively). Most, almost one fourth (24%), of midweek visitors stated they earned “\$125,000-\$150,000.” Lastly, 10% reported earnings of “over \$150,000” in 2007 before taxes.

The majority of respondents (89%) reported earnings higher than \$50,000. Only 11% of respondents reported earning of \$50,000 or below. The mid point of the salary ranges provided was \$99,835 per year, which is slightly lower than the holiday visitor's reported income (\$100,315).

Season Weekend Results:

Similar to the holiday and midweek visitors, 63 respondents (21%) refused to provide their income range.

Most, over one third (35%), of weekend snow users earned "under \$25,000" in 2007 before taxes. After this, income was fairly evenly distributed across categories. Eleven percent reported earning "\$25,000-\$50,000," 18% earned "\$50,000-\$75,000" and 13% reported earning "\$75,000-100,000." Only 8% said they made "\$125,000-\$150,000" and the smallest proportion (4%) made "over \$150,000" in 2007 before taxes.

Unlike, holiday and midweek visitors, the majority did not earn income greater than \$50,000. This is illustrated in the substantially lower midpoint income figure of weekend visitors of \$60,443; markedly lower than holiday (\$100,315) and midweek (\$99,835) snow users average 2007 income before taxes.

Season-End Summary Results:

Income of all visitors was fairly evenly distributed across categories. Fourteen percent of season-end visitors earned "under \$25,000." The lowest proportion (8%) reported earning "\$25,000-\$50,000." Most, one in five (20%) earned "\$50,000-\$75,000." Similar proportions covered the next three categories, "\$75,000-100,000" (15%), "\$100,000-\$125,000" (16%), and "\$125,000-\$150,000" (17%). Lastly, 10% made "over \$150,000" in 2007 before taxes. Twenty percent of the season-end visitors made under \$50,000. The midpoint of all snow users income in 2007 before taxes was \$86,699.

Question 10: Are you from the Flagstaff area (within 50 miles of Flagstaff, including Parks, Williams, & Winslow) or, do you own a second home in the Flagstaff area?

This question asked the respondent to identify whether they live in the Flagstaff area, defined as within 50 miles of Flagstaff to include Parks, Williams, and the Winslow areas. The question also qualified second homeowners within Flagstaff or owning a second home within 50 miles of Flagstaff. If they fell into this category; living in Flagstaff, living within 50 miles from Flagstaff, or as a second homeowner, they answered "yes." At this time, greater Flagstaff residents as defined in the survey, were thanked for their time with an Arizona Snowbowl drink coupon and the interview was complete.

For those who answered “no,” they do not live in Flagstaff or within 50 miles of Flagstaff, or own a second home in the area, the survey continued to query visitors with questions relevant to those that live outside of the greater Flagstaff area.

Holiday Results:

Of the 300 holiday visitors, the responses were almost evenly split with 48% of the participants living in the Flagstaff area and 52% living outside of the area. For those that said they live outside of the area (n=156), they continued with questions designed for non-residents, living more than 50 miles from the Flagstaff area.

Season Midweek Results:

Almost three quarters (73%) of the midweek visitors were from the Flagstaff area, while 27% where not. This is quite different from the holiday visitors where it was almost evenly split. Generally, this difference is expected as more of the weekday visitors would be local and holiday visitors, having more time, would be expected to live outside of the Flagstaff area.

Season Weekend Results:

Almost two thirds (63%) of weekend respondents were from the Flagstaff area and 37% said they resided outside of the area. These figures fall between holiday (an almost even split) and midweek (73% residents, 27% non-residents).

Season-End Summary Results:

Almost two thirds (61%) of all winter visitors were from the Flagstaff area. The remaining 39% resided outside of the greater Flagstaff area.

Question 11: How many times have you visited Flagstaff over the past 12 months?

Non-residents continued with the survey and were asked the number of times they visited Flagstaff within the past 12 months. Five categories were provided to the interviewer that included “1-2 times,” “3-5 times,” “6-10 times,” “11-20 times,” and “more than 20 times.” If the respondent was not sure, or could not remember, a “don’t know/can’t remember” category was available for selection.

Holiday Results:

An equal number of holiday respondents stated they visited Flagstaff “1-2 times” or “3-5 times” in the last year (37% each). Fourteen percent said they visited Flagstaff “6-10 times,” while 7% reported visiting “11-20 times.” Only 4% said they came to Flagstaff “more than 20 times” in the last year. Although not part of the valid percent calculation, 35 respondents (12%) selected “don’t know/can’t remember.” The mean number of times non-residents visited Flagstaff in the last twelve months was 5.09 different occasions.

Season Midweek Results:

Of the midweek snow users that were from outside of Flagstaff, 12% said they visited Flagstaff “1-2 times” in the last year. Most, almost one half (48%), stated they visited Flagstaff “3-5 times” in the last twelve months. One fifth (20%) visited “6-10 times,” while almost the same amount (18%) revealed “11-20 times.” Only 2% said they visited Flagstaff “more than 20 times.” Although not part of the valid percent calculation, 22 respondents (7%) selected “don’t know/can’t remember.” The mean number of times non-residents visited Flagstaff in the last twelve months was 6.89 different occasions. This is substantially higher than the holiday visitors mean (5.09).

Season Weekend Results:

Almost one in three weekend visitors (32%) told the interviewer they visited Flagstaff “1-2 times,” and almost one half (48%) stated “3-5 times.” Smaller proportions visited Flagstaff “6-10 times” (17%) in the last twelve months and only 3% “11-20 times.” None (0%) of the weekend visitors visited Flagstaff “more than 20 times.” Although not part of the valid percent calculation, a much smaller number of weekend visitors, 7 respondents (2%), selected “don’t know/can’t remember.” The mean number of times non-resident, weekend users visited Flagstaff in the last twelve months was 4.20 different occasions. In comparing this to the holiday mean of 5.09 and the midweek mean of 6.89, this figure is substantially lower, illustrating weekend, non-resident visitors frequent Flagstaff less often.

Season-End Summary Results:

Almost one third (30%) of all snow users have visited Flagstaff “1-2 times” in the past twelve months. Most (44%) visited “3-5 times.” Sixteen percent of all snow users frequented Flagstaff “6-10 times” in a year. A smaller proportion said they came to Flagstaff “11-20 times” (8%) and only 2% visited “more than 20 times” in a year. Although not part of the valid percent calculation, 64 respondents (7%), selected “don’t know/can’t remember.” The mean number of times non-resident, season-end visitors frequented Flagstaff in the last twelve months was 5.15 different occasions.

Question 12: Do you live in Arizona?

Respondents were asked whether they live in Arizona. If the visitor replied “yes,” then a follow-up question asked if they live in the “Phoenix area,” the “Tucson area,” or in an “other part of the state.” Once the respondent qualified the area of the state they live in, the interviewer asked them for their five-digit zip code. If the respondent replied “no,” they do not live in Arizona, then a follow-up question asked them “what state do you live in?” or, if they did not live in the United States, “what country” do you reside in?

Holiday Results:

Three quarters (75%) of the holiday visitors said they live in Arizona and one quarter (25%) stated they do not live in Arizona. For those who live in Arizona, almost three quarters (72%) live in the Phoenix area, one in five (20%) live in the Tucson area and 7% live in another part of the state.

For those that live in the Phoenix area (n=92), the range was spread over 59 zip codes for the Phoenix metropolitan area, with only two zip codes containing 4% each (n=4 each) of the respondents (85253, Paradise Valley; and 85303, Glendale). The remaining zip codes contained 3% or less (n=3 or less) of the total that responded. A single zip code did not stand out as one to be targeted for marketing purposes. For a complete listing of zip codes, see Appendix B.

Visitors that live in the Tucson area (n=26) reported 17 different zip codes. One zip code contained 11% of the respondents (n=3) (85712, Tucson). Most of the other zip codes that were represented (n=2 or less) delineate the city of Tucson. For a complete listing of Tucson zip codes, see Appendix B.

Participants that live outside of the Phoenix or Tucson area (n=9) contained eight different zip codes, varying from Chandler, Strawberry, Fry, Prescott, Prescott Valley, Clarkdale and Sedona. For a complete listing of other part of the state zip codes, see Appendix B.

For the quarter of visitors who live outside of Arizona (n=39), they were asked for either the state or the country name of their residence. All of the holiday visitors lived in another state and none of the respondents were from another country. The largest proportions of visitors were from California (36%, n=14), followed by Colorado (21%, n=8), New Mexico (18%, n=7) and Nevada (13%, n=5). Due to the small number of out-of-state visitors, it is difficult to pinpoint a distinct state frequenting Arizona Snowbowl. See Appendix B for a complete listing of visitors by state.

Season Midweek Results:

Seventy nine percent of midweek visitors stated they live in Arizona and 22% said they live outside of the state. Of those living in Arizona, the majority (84%) live in the Phoenix area, only 6% live in the Tucson area and 13% live in another part of the state.

For midweek respondents that live in the Phoenix area (n=52), the range was spread over 36 zip codes for the Phoenix metropolitan area, with all of the zip codes containing 1% or less of the responses. Therefore, a single zip code could not be identified to target marketing efforts. For a complete listing of zip codes, see Appendix B.

Only a few visitors were from the Tucson area (n=4) and each reported four separate zip codes. For a complete listing of Tucson zip codes, see Appendix B.

Participants that live outside of the Phoenix or Tucson area (n=8) contained six different zip codes; however six of the eight zip codes were unidentifiable in the United States Postal database. For the two that could be identified, the respondents were from Glendale, Luke Air Force Base and Kingman. For a complete listing of other part of the state zip codes, see Appendix B.

For the one in five that live outside of the state (n=17), the respondents identified five states. Most live in Colorado (35%, n=6), followed by California (24%, n=4), Nevada (24%, n=4), New Mexico (12%, n=2) and Utah (6%, n=1). With so few out-of-state midweek visitors, a distinct state was not identifiable. None of the visitors were from another country. For a complete listing of visitors by state, see Appendix B.

Season Weekend Results:

Similar to holiday and midweek users, slightly over three quarters (77%) of weekend visitors live in Arizona, while 24% live outside of the state. Of those that live in the state, 79% reside in the Phoenix metropolitan area, and an equal number reside in either the Tucson area or in another part of the state (10% each).

For midweek respondents that live in the Phoenix area (n=69), the range was spread over 20 zip codes for the Phoenix metropolitan area. Unlike holiday and midweek snow users, six zip codes had 7% or more reported. The highest number (15%, n=10) of respondents lived in Phoenix (85009), followed by Tempe (85284) (13%, n=9), Peoria (85381) (12%, n=8), Mesa (85205) (12%, n=8), Paradise Valley (85253) (7%, n=5), and Surprise/Sun City (85374) (7%, n=5). Although zip codes were more definitive in this case, given the small "n," it is still questionable whether a distinctive area can be targeted for marketing purposes. For a complete listing of Phoenix zip codes, see Appendix B.

Only nine weekend visitors were from the Tucson area; however, eight live in the same zip code area (85712), delineating Tucson. For a complete listing of Tucson zip codes, see Appendix B.

Of those living in another part of the state (n=9), three were from Prescott, and two each resided in Mayer (86333) and Kingman/Hualapai (86412). For a complete listing of other part of the state zip codes, see Appendix B.

Of the almost one quarter out of state weekend visitors (n=9), 15 were from New Mexico (58%), 23% (n=6) were from California and a smaller proportion was from Colorado (8%, n=2). One person each was from Florida, Nevada and Texas (4% each). None were from another country.

Season-End Summary Results:

Slightly over three quarters (76%) of all snow users live in Arizona, while 24% live outside of the state. Of those that live in the state, 77% reside in the Phoenix metropolitan area, 14% reside in the Tucson area and 9% live in another part of the state.

For season-end visitors living in the Phoenix metropolitan area (n=213), 91 zip codes were represented. Of the 91 zip codes represented, only four contained eleven or more respondents representing 5% to 6% each. The four zip codes include: Phoenix (85009) (6%, n=13), Tempe (85284) (6%, n=12), Peoria (85381) (6%, n=12), and Mesa (85205) (5%, n=11). In considering all visitors, a distinct zip code with a large “n” size does not stand out for targeted marketing purposes. For a complete listing of Phoenix zip codes, see Appendix B.

For season-end visitors living in the Tucson area (n=39), 18 zip codes were represented. Most (28%, n=11) had a zip code of 85712, representing Tucson. For a complete listing of Tucson zip codes, see Appendix B.

For those season-end visitors living in other parts of the state (n=26), only two zip codes had either four living in Prescott (86303) or three respondents residing in Kingman/Hualapai (86412). The remaining zip codes contained two or less respondents. For a complete listing of other part of the state zip codes, see Appendix B.

There were ten states that season-end respondents resided in. Season-end visitors that live outside of Arizona (n=82) contained two states with the largest number of respondents. Both California and New Mexico comprised 29% each (n=24 each). Following this, Colorado (20%, n=16) had the next largest number of respondents. Lastly, Nevada had 10 respondents (12%). The remaining six states contained two or less respondents. None of the visitors were from another country. See Appendix B for a complete listing of visitors by state.

Question 13: What accommodations, if any, will you be using when you stay overnight in Flagstaff?

Visitors living outside of the Flagstaff area were asked about the accommodations they would use while staying overnight in Flagstaff. The available selections included “not staying overnight in Flagstaff,” “staying in a hotel or motel,” “staying with friends or relatives,” “vacation rental,” or “other.” A “don’t know/not sure yet” category was available for visitors that did not have definite plans.

Holiday Results:

Almost one quarter (23%) of the non-resident holiday visitors said they were “not staying overnight in Flagstaff.” Most, almost one-half (46%), said they would be “staying in a hotel or motel,” while a close to even split followed with 15% “staying with friends or relatives” and 13% at a “vacation rental.” Only 3% revealed their accommodations fell into the “other” category.

Season Midweek Results:

A very small proportion of midweek visitors (4%) were “not staying overnight in Flagstaff.” Most, almost one-half (49%), said they would be “staying in a hotel or motel.” Next, 36% planned on “staying with friends or relatives,” and 11% said they would stay at a “vacation rental.” None (0%) of the midweek respondents selected the “other” category.

Season Weekend Results:

Almost one third (31%) of weekend visitors were “not staying overnight in Flagstaff.” Most (38%) said they would be “staying in a hotel or motel,” and one in five (20%) said they would be “staying with friends or relatives.” A much smaller proportion stated they would either stay at a “vacation rental” (7%) or use an “other” accommodation (4%).

Season-End Summary Results:

Slightly over one fifth (21%) of all snow users were “not staying overnight in Flagstaff.” Most (44%) stated they would be “staying in a hotel or motel.” Another 21% of respondents said they would be “staying with friends or relatives,” and 11% stayed in a “vacation rental.” Only 3% described their accommodations as “other.”

<h3>Question 14: What is the average nightly room rate of the hotel or motel where you are staying in Flagstaff?</h3>
--

Respondents that answered with “staying in a hotel or motel” were asked the average nightly room rate of the hotel or motel where they were staying. Range categories were provided which include “under \$50/night,” “\$50-\$75/night,” “\$76-\$100/night,” “\$101-\$125/night,” “\$126-\$150/night,” and “over \$150/night.” Again, a “don’t know/not sure yet” category was provided for those that did not know or had not selected a hotel/motel.

Holiday Results:

The lowest number of non-resident holiday respondents, only 10%, reported spending “under \$50/night.” The same number of visitors (24% each) reported their hotel cost them “\$50-\$75 per night” or “\$76-\$100 per night.” A near equal amount of responses crossed the next three categories with 13% stating “\$101-125 per night,” 16% of visitors reported spending “\$126-150 per night,” and 14% spending “over \$150 per night.” The mean of the average nightly room rate was \$95.90.

Season Midweek Results:

A very small proportion (3%) of midweek respondents reported spending “under \$50/night” on their hotel/motel. A similar number of visitors said they either spent “\$50-\$75 per night” (24%), “\$76-\$100 per night” (30%) and “\$101-125 per night” (24%). Eleven percent said they spent “\$126-150 per night,” and lastly, only 8% revealed their hotel/motel cost them “\$126-150 per night.” None (0%) of the respondents reported spending “over \$150/night.” The mean of the average nightly room rate was \$96.61. This amount is very close to the mean nightly room rate of holiday visitors (\$95.90).

Season Weekend Results:

One in three weekend visitors (34%) reported spending “under \$50/night” on their hotel/motel while staying in Flagstaff. Only 10% stated they would expend “\$50-\$75 per night.” Almost one fifth (19%) reported spending “\$76-\$100 per night,” and one quarter (25%) said “\$101-125 per night.” A smaller proportion of weekend visitors revealed an equal amount in the last two categories, spending “\$126-150 per night” and “over \$150 per night” (6% each). The mean of the average nightly room rate was \$77.20. This amount is much lower than the mean nightly room rate of holiday visitors (\$95.90) and midweek visitors (\$96.61).

Season-End Summary Results:

For all snow users, 14% reported spending “under \$50/night” on the average nightly room rate of the hotel/motel where they were staying. Slightly over one fifth (21%) said they spent “\$50-\$75 per night.” Most, slightly less than one quarter (24%), stated their expenditures would be “\$76-\$100 per night.” Another 18% spent “\$101-125 per night.” Similar amounts were reported for the following two categories, with 12% of respondents spending “\$126-150 per night,” and 11% spending “over \$150 per night.” The mean of the average nightly room rate for all snow users was \$91.56.

Question 15:**During this trip, how many nights will you be staying in Flagstaff?**

Arizona Snowbowl visitors reporting in Question 14 they were staying overnight in Flagstaff were asked how many nights they would stay during their trip. The categories provided include “1 night,” “2 nights,” “3 nights,” “4 nights,” “5 nights,” “more than 5 nights,” and “don’t know/not sure yet.”

Holiday Results:

Seventeen percent of the non-resident holiday visitors said they were staying “one night.” Most, A little over one third (35%), said they would stay “two nights,” while a little over one fourth (26%) reported staying “three nights.” Eleven percent planned to stay for “four nights.” Only 6% of visitors were staying in Flagstaff for “five nights” and similarly, 7% planned to stay “more than 5 nights.” The average number of nights holiday visitors stayed in Flagstaff was 2.74 nights.

Season Midweek Results:

Only 8% of midweek snow users were staying “one night” while in Flagstaff. Almost one half (48%) were planning on staying “two nights,” while slightly over one quarter (28%) said they planned “three nights.” Fourteen percent reported an overnight stay of “four nights.” None (0%) of the midweek visitors said they would stay “five nights.” A very small proportion (1%) stayed “more than 5 nights.” The average number of nights midweek visitors stayed in Flagstaff was 2.53 nights. This is a slightly lower average number of nights than the holiday visitors’ stay (2.74).

Season Weekend Results:

Fourteen percent of weekend visitors reported they would stay “one night” in Flagstaff. The largest proportion, half (50%), said they are planning on staying “two nights,” while slightly over one quarter (26%) said they planned on staying “three nights.” Much smaller proportions reported either “four nights” (4%), “five nights” (1%), and “more than 5 nights” (4%). The average number of nights a weekend visitor stayed in Flagstaff was 2.42 nights. This is slightly less than holiday (2.74) and midweek (2.53).

Season-End Summary Results:

Thirteen percent of season-end visitors would stay “one night.” The most (43%) said they would stay “two nights.” A little over one fourth (27%) stayed “three nights,” while 10% stayed “4 nights.” Only 3% stayed “5 nights” and 4% “more than 5 nights.” The mean average number of nights all snow users stayed was 2.6.

Question 16: During this trip, on average, how much will EACH PERSON in your party spend, per DAY, on food and beverage, including cocktails, at restaurants & bars while in Flagstaff and at the ski area(s)?

Arizona Snowbowl visitors were asked the amount each person in their party would spend each day on food and beverage, which includes cocktails at bars and restaurants in Flagstaff and in the ski area. The following categories were available for selection: “none,” “under \$10 per person per day,” “\$10-20 per person per day,” “\$21-40 per person per day,” “\$41-60 per person per day,” “\$61-80 per person per day,” “\$81-100 per person per day,” “over \$100 per person per day.” A selection of “don’t know” was available for those who were not sure of the amount. This information will provide data to determine the economic impact Arizona Snowbowl visitors have while staying in Flagstaff (see Economic Impact Section for analysis and summary).

Holiday Results:

Only 1% of non-resident holiday snow users said “none,” they would not spend any money on food and beverage in Flagstaff and in the ski area. Similarly, only 4% reported they would spend “under \$10 per person per day.” Most, almost one third (29%), of holiday respondents reported each person in their party would spend “\$10-\$20 per person per day,” while a close second (26%) said “\$21-\$40 per person per day.” Following this, almost the same amounts were reported for the “\$41-60 per person per day” and “\$61-\$80 per person per day” categories (17% and 18% respectively). A small number of respondents told the interviewer that they spent between “\$81-100 per person per day” and “over \$100 per person per day” (2% and 4% respectively). The mean average amount each person in a holiday party spent per day on food and beverage was \$38.59.

Season Midweek Results:

There were no (0%) midweek visitors that reported “none,” they would spend no money on food and beverage in Flagstaff and in the ski area during their visit. A very small proportion (1%) stated they would spend “under \$10 per person per day.” Most of the respondents (43%) said they would spend “\$10-\$20 per person per day.” Almost the same amount of visitors said they would spend either “\$21-\$40 per person per day” (29%) or “\$41-60 per person per day” (23%). Only 4% reported spending “\$61-\$80 per person per day.” None of the respondents (0%) told the interviewer that they spent between “\$81-100 per person per day” or “over \$100 per person per day.” The mean average amount each person in a party spent per day on food and beverage was \$29.76. This is substantially lower than the holiday visitors’ average amount spent (\$38.59).

Season Weekend Results:

The amount spent on food and beverage for weekend respondents was fairly evenly distributed across categories. Ten percent of weekend respondents told the interviewer they spent “none,” or no money on food and beverage while in Flagstaff or on the mountain. Fourteen percent stated they would spend “under \$10 per person per day.” The largest amount of visitors reported (26%) spending “\$10-\$20 per person per day.” The same amounts were reported for “\$21-\$40 per person per day” or “\$41-60 per person per day” (14% each). Almost one fifth (19%) said they would expend “\$61-\$80 per person per day.” The smallest number of weekend visitors spent “\$81-100 per person per day” (2%) and none (0%) spent “over \$100 per person per day.” The mean average amount each person in a party spent per day on food and beverage was \$31.89. This figure is slightly higher than the midweek visitors’ average (\$29.76) and is notably lower than the holiday visitors’ average (\$38.59).

Season-End Summary Results:

Only 2% of all visitors reported spending “none,” or no money on food and beverages while in Flagstaff or on the mountain. Another small proportion (5%) stated they spent “under \$10 per person per day.” Most of the respondents (32%) said they spent “\$10-\$20 per person per day.” One in four (25%) reported spending “\$21-\$40 per person per day.” There were 18% of visitors that spent “\$41-60 per person per day,” and 14% said “\$61-\$80 per person per day.” Only 2% each reported spending either “\$81-100 per person per day” or “over \$100 per person per day.” The mean average amount each person in a season-end party spent per day on food and beverage was \$34.91.

Question 17: During this trip, on average, how much will EACH PERSON in your party spend, per DAY, on all other items purchased in Flagstaff? This includes retail items, services provided in the city, as well as lift tickets, rentals, and expenses on the mountain. Do NOT include food or beverage expenditures.

Similar to Question 16, Arizona Snowbowl visitors were asked to report the amount spent in their party by each person on a daily basis for all other items purchased in Flagstaff. They were told by the interviewer to include retail items, services provide in the city, lift tickets, ski rentals, and other expenditures on the mountain. In addition, they were instructed to omit food and beverage expenditures in their calculations. Eight categories were available for selection that included “none,” “under \$10 per person per day,” “\$10-25 per person per day,” “\$26-50 per person per day,” “\$51-100 per person per day,” “\$101-150 per person per day,” “\$151-250 per person per day,” and “over \$250 per person per day.” A “don’t know/not sure” category was provided for those who could not present a figure. Coupled with data from Question 16, this will provide information in determining the economic impact out-of-town visitors have on Arizona Snowbowl and the City of Flagstaff (see Economic Impact Section for analysis and summary).

Holiday Results:

Only 3% of the out-of-town holiday visitors reported each person in their party would spend “none,” or no expenditures on other items in Flagstaff or on the mountain. Another small proportion (5%) stated they would spend “under \$10 per person per day.” Seventeen percent estimated their expenditures would fall in the “\$10-25 per person per day” category. Almost half of visitors fell in to either “\$26-50 per person per day (24%),” or “\$51-100 per person per day” (25%) categories. The “\$101-150 per person per day” category carried 18% of respondent’s expenditures, while 8% of holiday respondents said they would spend “\$151-250 per person per day.” None of the respondents (0%) reported spending “over \$250 per person per day.” The mean average amount a visitor spent on other items per person per day was \$69.52.

Season Midweek Results:

None of the midweek respondents stated they would spend “none” or “under \$10 per person per day” on other items in Flagstaff or at Arizona Snowbowl. Almost equal amounts said they would spend “\$10-25 per person per day” (29%), “\$26-50 per person per day (34%), or “\$51-100 per person per day” (32%). Only 6% said they planned on spending “\$101-150 per person per day,” and none of the respondents (0%) said “\$151-250 per person per day” or “over \$250 per person per day.” The mean average amount a visitor spent on other items per person per day was \$48.71. This figure is substantially lower than the amount holiday visitors spent on other items in Flagstaff and on the mountain (\$69.52).

Season Weekend Results:

Fifteen percent of weekend snow users said “none,” they would not spend any money on other items while in Flagstaff or at Arizona Snowbowl. Only 5% reported spending “under \$10 per person per day.” The same amounts were reported for the next two categories, “\$10-25 per person per day” and “\$26-50 per person per day” (18% each). Most, slightly over one quarter (26%), stated they would spend “\$51-100 per person per day.” Thirteen percent thought they would expend “\$101-150 per person per day,” and only 5% said “\$151-250 per person per day.” None of the respondents (0%) selected the “over \$250 per person per day” category. The mean average amount a weekend visitor spent on other items per person per day was \$55.95. As with the food and beverage, this figure is higher than the midweek visitor’s expenditure on other items (\$48.71), but lower than the holiday visitors’ average (\$69.52).

Season-End Summary Results:

The same amount of season-end visitors spent either “none” or “under \$10 per person per day” on other items in Flagstaff or at Arizona Snowbowl (4% each). Similar amounts were reported in the following three categories with 21% spending “\$10-25 per person per day,” 26% spending “\$26-50 per person per day,” and 27% stating “\$51-100 per person per day.” Fourteen percent of respondents spent between “\$101-150 per person per day,” and only 5% said they spent “\$151-250 per person per day” on other items in Flagstaff or on the mountain. None of the respondents (0%) selected the “over \$250 per person per day” category. The mean average amount season-end visitors spent on other items per person per day were \$61.39.

Question 18: While staying in Flagstaff, what other sites, attractions or events do you plan to see? Read list if necessary. Mark all that apply.

Arizona Snowbowl visitors living outside of Flagstaff were asked to name other sites, attractions, or events they plan to see during their stay. There were 16 possible selections available on the survey that include “Coconino Center for the Arts,” “Downtown Flagstaff (Heritage Square),” “Flagstaff Nordic Center,” “Flagstaff Winterfest,” “Grand Canyon National Park,” “Lowell Observatory,” “Museum of Northern Arizona,” “Events at Northern Arizona University,” “Pine Cone Drop (New Years),” “Riordan Mansion State Historic Park,” “Shopping,” “Snow Play,” “Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument,” “Walnut Canyon National Monument,” “Wupatki National Monument,” and “Other.” A “don’t know” category was provided for those who were not sure if they would visit other places while staying in Flagstaff. The information provided by this question gives valuable data towards the effect Arizona Snowbowl visitation has on other area attractions, sites, and events and may identify organizations that might want to partner in marketing efforts.

Holiday Results:

Of the 17 categories provided, three contained most of the responses, including; “snow play” (63%), “shopping” (48%), and “downtown Flagstaff” (32%). A small proportion said they would visit “Coconino Center for the Arts,” “Flagstaff Nordic Center” and “Flagstaff Winterfest” (3%, 2% and 7% respectively). “Grand Canyon National Park” yielded a relatively higher number of responses (14%). Another small proportion of respondents revealed they would visit “Lowell Observatory” (7%), “Museum of Northern Arizona” (6%), and “Events at Northern Arizona University” (2%). The “Pine Cone Drop (New Years)” commanded a relatively higher proportion of responses (13%). All remaining attractions/events listed on the survey yielded a small number of responses including, “Riordan Mansion State Historic Park” (3%), “Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument” (3%), “Walnut Canyon National Monument” (2%), “Wupatki National Monument” (2%) and “Other” (5%).

Season Midweek Results:

Over three quarters of the midweek non-resident respondents (78%) told the interviewer they would also partake in “snow play” while visiting Flagstaff. Almost one half (47%) said they would visit “downtown Flagstaff,” and a little over one third (36%) said they would go “shopping.” Ten percent said they would take in the “Grand Canyon National Park.” After this, small proportions said they would visit “Lowell Observatory” (4%), “Museum of Northern Arizona” (5%), and “Events at Northern Arizona University” (1%).

Season Weekend Results:

Almost one half (48%) of weekend snow users said they would also visit the “snow play” area. Following this, 35% stated they planned to go to “downtown Flagstaff.” A fairly large number (25%) selected the “other” category to describe other sites, attractions, or events they plan to see during their stay. The same amount, one fifth each (20%), would go “shopping” and make a trip to the “Grand Canyon National Park.” The remaining selections are listed in the order they were presented on the survey that include: “Coconino Center for the Arts” (1%), “Flagstaff Nordic Center” (2%), “Flagstaff Winterfest” (1%), “Lowell Observatory” (13%), “Museum of Northern Arizona” (6%), “Events at Northern Arizona University” (12%), The “Pine Cone Drop (New Years)” (1%), “Riordan Mansion State Historic Park” (0%), “Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument” (2%), “Walnut Canyon National Monument” (1%), and “Wupatki National Monument” (0%).

Season-End Summary Results:

The majority of all snow users (63%) planned to visit the “snow play” area while in Flagstaff. Almost the same amounts, a little over one third each, planned to visit “downtown Flagstaff” and go “shopping” (37% and 36% respectively). The next most frequently selected attraction was to visit the “Grand Canyon National Park” (15%). Eleven percent of respondents selected “other” in describing an event or attraction they will visit while in Flagstaff. “Lowell Observatory” came in next with 8% of the responses. The remaining selections are listed in the order they were presented on the survey that include: “Coconino Center for the Arts” (2%), “Flagstaff Nordic Center” (2%), “Flagstaff Winterfest” (3%), “Museum of Northern Arizona” (6%), “Events at Northern Arizona University” (5%), The “Pine Cone Drop (New Years)” (6%), “Riordan Mansion State Historic Park” (1%), “Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument” (2%), “Walnut Canyon National Monument” (1%), and “Wupatki National Monument” (1%).

This concludes the main body of the study. Please refer to other sections, including; Executive Summary, Economic Impact Summary, assorted Appendices, etc. For any related questions, please contact:

- Dr. Gary Vallen; President
- Gary Vallen Hospitality Consultants
- (928) 853-8748.

Winter Visitors Study 2008-2009

Flagstaff Convention and Visitors Bureau



Appendix A

Sample Survey Form

AZ Snowbowl & Flagstaff Nordic Center

Visitor Survey 2008-2009

1. Date Category

- ☐ Midweek (Mon -Friday, excluding holiday dates)
- ☐ Weekend (Sat. or Sunday, excluding holiday dates)
- ☐ Holiday (Tuesday Dec. 23rd - Sunday Jan. 4th)

2. Location

- ☐ Arizona Snowbowl
- ☐ Flagstaff Nordic Center

3. Gender of Participant

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

Interviewer: Verify that respondent is at least 18 years of age if there is any doubt.

Welcome to Arizona Snowbowl and/or the Flagstaff Nordic Center, Arizona's premier ski areas – where folks are friendly and the snow is sparkling. You have been randomly selected to participate in a visitor questionnaire. To thank you for participating, we will give you a free beverage coupon. Although, not obligated, we hope you will take a few minutes to respond to these questions. Your answers will help us understand your visit to Flagstaff and how we can improve services to you.

4. Including yourself, how many adults, 18 years and older, and children are in your party today?

of Adults

of Children

Example: Use a single number in each box
Enter "04" for "4"

5. Are you with family, friends, people you work with or a special group (club, church, tour group etc.)? Mark all that apply.

- ☐ Visiting Alone ☐ Family ☐ Friends ☐ People I work with ☐ A Special Group (club, church, tour group etc.)

6. In thinking about your experience with the ski area's STAFF, how would you rate your overall customer service experience today?

- ☐ Excellent ☐ Very Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐ Don't Know/Not Sure

7. In terms of your overall ski area experience - considering all elements of today's visit - how would you rate today's overall experience?

- ☐ Excellent ☐ Very Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐ Don't Know/Not Sure

8. What is your age? Please stop me at the correct category.

- ☐ 18-23 years ☐ 40-49 years ☐ 70-79 years
- ☐ 24-29 years ☐ 50-59 years ☐ 80 years or more
- ☐ 30-39 years ☐ 60-69 years ☐ Refused

9. What was your combined household income in 2008, before taxes? Please stop me at the correct category.

- ☐ Under \$25,000 ☐ \$75,000 - 100,000 (\$99,999) ☐ Over \$150,000
- ☐ \$25,000 - 50,000 (\$49,999) ☐ \$100,000 - 125,000 (\$124,999) ☐ Refused
- ☐ \$50,000 - 75,000 (\$74,999) ☐ \$125,000 - 150,000 (\$149,999)

10. Are you from the Flagstaff area (within 50 miles of Flagstaff, including Parks, Williams, & Winslow) or, do you own a second home in the Flagstaff area?

- ☐ Yes Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey, have a great rest of the day at the ski area(s). DRINK COUPON.
- ☐ No CONTINUE to the second page

11. How many times have you visited Flagstaff over the past 12 months?

- ☐ 1-2 times ☐ 6-10 times ☐ More than 20 times
☐ 3-5 times ☐ 11-20 times ☐ Don't know/Can't remember

12. Do you live in Arizona?

☐ Yes Phoenix Area? Zip code Tucson Area? Zip code Other Part of State? Zip code

☐ No What state do you live in? or, If from outside of the U.S. what country?
 (Interviewer: Verify spelling)

13. What accommodations, if any, will you be using when you stay overnight in Flagstaff?

- ☐ Not staying overnight in Flagstaff (Skip to Q #16)
☐ Staying in a hotel or motel (continue to Q #14)
☐ Staying with friends or relatives (Skip to Q #15)
☐ Vacation rental (timeshare) (Skip to Q #15)
☐ Other (Skip to Q #15)
☐ Don't know/Not sure yet (Skip to Q #15)

14. What is the average nightly room rate of the hotel or motel where you are staying in Flagstaff?

- ☐ Under \$50/night ☐ \$126 - \$150/night
☐ \$50 - \$75/night ☐ Over \$150/night
☐ \$76 - \$100 per night ☐ Don't know/Not sure yet
☐ \$101 - \$125/night

15. During this trip, how many nights will you be staying in Flagstaff?

- ☐ 1 night ☐ 3 nights ☐ 5 nights ☐ Don't know/Not sure yet
☐ 2 nights ☐ 4 nights ☐ More than 5 nights

16. During this trip, on average, how much will EACH PERSON in your party spend, per DAY, on food and beverage, including cocktails, at restaurants & bars while in Flagstaff and at the ski area(s)?

- ☐ None ☐ \$21 - 40 per person per day ☐ \$81 - 100 per person per day
☐ Under \$10 per person per day ☐ \$41 - 60 per person per day ☐ Over \$100 per person per day
☐ \$10-20 per person per day ☐ \$61 - 80 per person per day ☐ Don't Know

17. During this trip, on average, how much will EACH PERSON in your party spend, per DAY, on all other items purchased in Flagstaff? This includes retail items, services provided in the city, as well as lift tickets, rentals, and expenses on the mountain. Do NOT include food or beverage expenditures.

- ☐ None ☐ \$26 - 50 per person per day ☐ \$151 - 250 per person per day
☐ Under \$10 per person per day ☐ \$51 - 100 per person per day ☐ Over \$250 per person per day
☐ \$10-25 per person per day ☐ \$101 - 150 per person per day ☐ Don't know/Not sure

18. While staying in Flagstaff, what other sites, attractions or events do you plan to see? Read list if necessary. Mark all that apply.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Arizona Snowbowl (if at Nordic Center) | <input type="radio"/> Lowell Observatory | <input type="radio"/> Snow Play |
| <input type="radio"/> Coconino Center for the Arts | <input type="radio"/> Museum of Northern Arizona | <input type="radio"/> Sunset Crater Volcano NM |
| <input type="radio"/> Downtown Flagstaff (Heritage Square) | <input type="radio"/> Events at Northern Arizona University | <input type="radio"/> Walnut Canyon NM |
| <input type="radio"/> Flagstaff Nordic Center (if at AZ Snowbowl) | <input type="radio"/> Pine Cone Drop (New Years) | <input type="radio"/> Wupatki NM |
| <input type="radio"/> Flagstaff Winterfest | <input type="radio"/> Riordan Mansion State Historic Park | <input type="radio"/> Other |
| <input type="radio"/> Grand Canyon National Park | <input type="radio"/> Shopping | <input type="radio"/> Don't Know |

Winter Visitors Study 2008-2009

Flagstaff Convention and Visitors Bureau



Appendix B

**Zip Codes by Period;
Holiday, Midweek, Weekend and
Season Summary**

Winter Visitor Study 2008-2009

Appendix B

Zip Codes; Holiday Period: Phoenix, Tucson, Other Cities in Arizona, and Other States

Phoenix Zip Codes

	Frequency	Valid Percent
85009	3	3.3
85020	1	1.1
85022	1	1.1
85023	1	1.1
85028	2	2.2
85032	2	2.2
85044	1	1.1
85048	1	1.1
85050	1	1.1
85086	2	2.2
85127	1	1.1
85205	2	2.2
85206	1	1.1
85209	3	3.3
85213	1	1.1
85215	1	1.1
85224	1	1.1
85234	2	2.2
85239	1	1.1
85244	1	1.1
85247	1	1.1
85249	1	1.1
85251	1	1.1
85253	4	4.3
85254	2	2.2

85255	3	3.3
85258	1	1.1
85259	1	1.1
85261	1	1.1
85262	2	2.2
85264	1	1.1
85265	1	1.1
85266	1	1.1
85267	2	2.2
85278	2	2.2
85279	1	1.1
85284	3	3.3
85289	1	1.1
85292	1	1.1
85296	1	1.1
85297	1	1.1
85301	1	1.1
85303	4	4.3
85304	2	2.2
85308	1	1.1
85310	2	2.2
85312	1	1.1
85313	1	1.1
85317	1	1.1
85318	3	3.3
85338	1	1.1
85373	1	1.1
85374	2	2.2
85377	2	2.2
85379	2	2.2
85381	3	3.3

85387	1	1.1
85412	2	2.2
85414	1	1.1
Total	92	100.0

Tucson Zip Codes

	Frequency	Valid Percent
85712	3	11.5
85716	2	7.7
85718	1	3.8
85719	2	7.7
85720	2	7.7
85727	1	3.8
85728	1	3.8
85730	2	7.7
85733	1	3.8
85734	1	3.8
85740	2	7.7
85741	1	3.8
85742	1	3.8
85743	1	3.8
85744	2	7.7
85748	1	3.8
85750	2	7.7
Total	26	100.0

Other Part of State Zip Codes

	Frequency	Valid Percent
85249	1	11.1
85544	1	11.1
85635	1	11.1
86303	1	11.1
86308	1	11.1
86314	2	22.2
86324	1	11.1
86351	1	11.1
Total	9	100.0

Other State

	Frequency	Valid Percent
CA	14	35.9
CO	8	20.5
FL	1	2.5
IL	1	2.5
IN	1	2.5
NM	7	17.9
NV	5	12.8
TX	1	2.5
WI	1	2.5
Total	39	100.0

Winter Visitor Study 2008-2009

Appendix B

Zip Codes; Midweek Period: Phoenix, Tucson, Other Cities in Arizona, and Other States

Phoenix Zip Codes

	Frequency	Valid Percent
85017	1	1.9
85023	1	1.9
85074	1	1.9
85076	1	1.9
85205	1	1.9
85208	2	3.8
85209	1	1.9
85212	1	1.9
85234	1	1.9
85237	2	3.8
85238	1	1.9
85246	1	1.9
85247	1	1.9
85248	2	3.8
85257	2	3.8
85260	1	1.9
85267	3	5.8
85268	1	1.9
85269	1	1.9
85270	2	3.8
85271	1	1.9
85285	1	1.9
85286	1	1.9
85287	4	7.7

85303	1	1.9
85307	1	1.9
85308	1	1.9
85309	1	1.9
85312	2	3.8
85374	2	3.8
85376	1	1.9
85379	2	3.8
85381	1	1.9
85383	3	5.8
85384	1	1.9
85385	2	3.8
Total	52	100.0

Tucson Zip Codes

	Frequency	Valid Percent
85718	1	25.0
85723	1	25.0
85730	1	25.0
85740	1	25.0
Total	4	100.0

Other Part of State Zip Code

	Frequency	Valid Percent
85309	1	12.5
85412	2	25.0
86307	1	12.5
86309	1	12.5
86310	2	25.0
86412	1	12.5
Total	8	100.0

Other State

	Frequency	Valid Percent
CA	4	23.5
CO	6	35.3
NM	2	11.8
NV	4	23.4
UT	1	6.0
Total	17	100.1

Winter Visitor Study 2008-2009

Appendix B

Zip Codes; Weekend Period: Phoenix, Tucson, Other Cities in Arizona, and Other States

Phoenix Zip Codes

	Frequency	Valid Percent
85009	10	14.5
85204	1	1.4
85205	8	11.6
85209	1	1.4
85234	4	5.8
85244	2	2.9
85247	1	1.4
85253	5	7.2
85284	9	13.0
85301	2	2.9
85302	1	1.4
85303	3	4.3
85374	5	7.2
85381	8	11.6
85712	2	2.9
86303	3	4.3
86412	1	1.4
89205	1	1.4
89234	1	1.4
89381	1	1.4
Total	69	100.0

Tucson Zip Codes

	Frequency	Valid Percent
85712	8	88.9
85733	1	11.1
Total	9	100.0

Other Part of State Zip Code

	Frequency	Valid Percent
86303	3	33.3
86312	1	11.1
86333	2	22.2
86412	2	22.2
87404	1	11.1
Total	9	100.0

Other State

	Frequency	Valid Percent
CA	6	23.1
CO	2	8.0
FL	1	3.8
NM	15	57.7
NV	1	3.8
TX	1	3.8
Total	26	100.2

Winter Visitor Study 2008-2009

Appendix B

Zip Codes; Season-End Summary Data: Phoenix, Tucson, Other Cities in Arizona, and Other States

Phoenix Zip Codes

	Frequency	Valid Percent
85009	13	6.1
85017	1	.5
85020	1	.5
85022	1	.5
85023	2	.9
85028	2	.9
85032	2	.9
85044	1	.5
85048	1	.5
85050	1	.5
85074	1	.5
85076	1	.5
85086	2	.9
85127	1	.5
85204	1	.5
85205	11	5.2
85206	1	.5
85208	2	.9
85209	5	2.3
85212	1	.5
85213	1	.5
85215	1	.5
85224	1	.5
85234	7	3.3
85237	2	.9
85238	1	.5
85239	1	.5
85244	3	1.4

85246	1	.5
85247	3	1.4
85248	2	.9
85249	1	.5
85251	1	.5
85253	9	4.2
85254	2	.9
85255	3	1.4
85257	2	.9
85258	1	.5
85259	1	.5
85260	1	.5
85261	1	.5
85262	2	.9
85264	1	.5
85265	1	.5
85266	1	.5
85267	5	2.3
85268	1	.5
85269	1	.5
85270	2	.9
85271	1	.5
85278	2	.9
85279	1	.5
85284	12	5.6
85285	1	.5
85286	1	.5
85287	4	1.9
85289	1	.5
85292	1	.5
85296	1	.5
85297	1	.5
85301	3	1.4
85302	1	.5
85303	8	3.8

85304	2	.9
85307	1	.5
85308	2	.9
85309	1	.5
85310	2	.9
85312	3	1.4
85313	1	.5
85317	1	.5
85318	3	1.4
85338	1	.5
85373	1	.5
85374	9	4.2
85376	1	.5
85377	2	.9
85379	4	1.9
85381	12	5.6
85383	3	1.4
85384	1	.5
85385	2	.9
85387	1	.5
85412	2	.9
85414	1	.5
85712	2	.9
86303	3	1.4
86412	1	.5
89205	1	.5
89234	1	.5
89381	1	.5
Total	213	100.0

Tucson Zip Codes

	Frequency	Valid Percent
85712	11	28.2
85716	2	5.1
85718	2	5.1
85719	2	5.1
85720	2	5.1
85723	1	2.6
85727	1	2.6
85728	1	2.6
85730	3	7.7
85733	2	5.1
85734	1	2.6
85740	3	7.7
85741	1	2.6
85742	1	2.6
85743	1	2.6
85744	2	5.1
85748	1	2.6
85750	2	5.1
Total	39	100.0

Other Part of State Zip Code

	Frequency	Valid Percent
85249	1	3.8
85309	1	3.8
85412	2	7.7
85544	1	3.8
85635	1	3.8
86303	4	15.4
86307	1	3.8
86308	1	3.8
86309	1	3.8
86310	2	7.7
86312	1	3.8
86314	2	7.7
86324	1	3.8
86333	2	7.7
86351	1	3.8
86412	3	11.5
87404	1	3.8
Total	26	100.0

Other State

	Frequency	Valid Percent
CA	24	29.3
CO	16	20.0
FL	2	2.4
IL	1	1.0
IN	1	1.0
NM	24	29.2
NV	10	12.2
TX	2	2.4
UT	1	1.0
WI	1	1.0
Total	82	99.5

Winter Visitors Study 2008-2009

**Flagstaff Convention and Visitors Bureau
in cooperation with
Arizona Snowbowl Ski Resort**



Appendix C

**Graphical Representation of
Season-End Summary Data
(PowerPoint)**